

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 19-24, 26, and 27, were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Sorrells (US 3,045,252). Claim 37 was previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorrells (US 3,045,252). Claims 25, 28-36, and 38, were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were considered allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Amendments to the Claims:

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 19 and 28.

Examiner Interview

Telephone interview with Examiner Maust was concluded 10/29/2008. Examiner was provided with amended claim 19 for review. Examiner agreed that the amended claim traversed the cited art and would be allowable, pending a review of the prior art.

Sorrells

Claim 19 has been rewritten and now includes the element that the fluid separated from the applicator can be discarded directly to the waste receptacle without passing the fluid through the applicator bath and without disconnecting the fluid reservoir from the fluid dispenser. The amendment is supported, for example, in Figures 2, 3A, 4, 6A, and 7.

Regarding Claim 19, Sorrells teaches a cleaning system that enables the fluid separated from the applicator to be discarded directly to the waste receptacle by removing the fluid reservoir from the system, which disconnects the fluid reservoir from the fluid dispenser and exposes the waste receptacle.

The current invention is configured so that a part of the waste receptacle is exposed even when the fluid reservoir is mounted to the cleaning system with the fluid dispenser fluid-wire connected to the dispenser. This configuration is useful in facilitating maximum cleanliness by bypassing the applicator bath when discarding fluid from the applicator to the waste receptacle.

Sorrells does not teach or suggest a cleaning system configured so that fluid separated from the applicator can be discarded directly to the waste receptacle without passing the fluid through the applicator bath and without disconnecting the reservoir from the dispenser.

Claims 20-27 and 37 all depend from the amended claim 19 and contain all the limitations of claim 19.

Claim 28 has been amended by rewriting the claim as an independent claim, including all the limitations of the previous base claim, as suggested by the examiner in the previous office action, and is allowable per the examiner's previous evaluation.

Claims 29-36, and 38, all depend from amended claim 28 and contain all the limitations of claim 28.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Office Action with respect to Claims 19-38 is requested. Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance or at least in better form for appeal.

In the event the examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /David J Bremer/
David J Bremer, Reg. No. 51,497
773-271-6600